



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,705	09/30/2004	Henry W. Grant, Jr.	014033.000047	5704

24239 7590 02/14/2008
MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC
P.O. BOX 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

NORMAN, SAMICA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3696

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/14/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/711,705	Applicant(s) GRANT, JR. ET AL.	
	Examiner SAMICA L. NORMAN	Art Unit 3694	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060428</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-36 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-10, 15 and 22 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
3. Regarding claim 1. Claim 1 recites the phrase "predetermined function." It is unclear as to what function is being performed.
4. Claims 2-10 contain the same deficiencies as claim 1 through dependency and, as such, are rejected for the same reasons.
5. Regarding claims 5, 15 and 22. These claims recite the phrases "customer knowledge or sophistication" and "sophistication or complexity of the selected financial product or instrument." It is unclear as to how the degree of knowledge, sophistication and complexity are determined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-16 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

8. Referring to claims 1 and 27. In many instances it is clear within which of the enumerated categories a claimed invention falls. The question of whether a claim encompasses statutory subject matter should not focus on which of the four categories of subject matter a claim is directed to -- process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter -- but rather on the essential characteristics of the subject matter, in particular, its practical utility. In the instant invention, the claimed subject matter does not cover either a 101 judicial exception or a practical application of a 101 judicial exception. The claimed subject matter is merely directed towards an abstract idea. While a scientific truth, or the mathematical expression of it, is not a patentable invention, a novel and useful structure created with the aid of knowledge or scientific truth may be. *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 188, 209 USPQ at 8-9. *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185, 209 USPQ at 7; accord, e.g., *Chakrabarty*, 447 U.S. at 309, 206 USPQ at 197; *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 589, 198 USPQ 193, 197 (1978); *Benson*, 409 U.S. at 67-68, 175 USPQ at 675; *Funk*, 333 U.S. at 130, 76 USPQ at 281. “A principle, in the abstract, is a fundamental truth; an original cause; a motive; these cannot be patented, as no one can claim in either of them an exclusive right.” *Le Roy*, 55 U.S. (14 How.) at 175.

9. Claims 2-16, 28 and 29 contain the same deficiencies as claims 1 and 27 through dependency and, as such, are rejected for the same reasons.

10. Claims 1-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

11. Regarding claims 1, 11, 17, 27 and 30. The claimed invention as a whole must be useful and accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373-74, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. The purpose of this requirement is to limit patent protection to inventions that possess a certain level of “real world” value, as opposed to subject matter that represents nothing more than an idea or concept, or is simply a starting point for future investigation or research (Brenner v. Manson, 383 U.S. 519, 528-36, 148 USPQ 689, 693-96 (1966)); In re Fisher, 421 F.3d 1365, 76 USPQ2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 2005); In re Ziegler, 992 F.2d 1197, 1200-03, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603-06 (Fed. Cir. 1993)). In the instant application the invention fails to provides a practical application that produces a useful, tangible and concrete result.

12. Claims 2-10, 12-16, 18-26, 28, 19 and 31-36 contain the same deficiencies as claims 1, 11, 17, 27 and 30 through dependency and, as such, are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

14. Claims 1-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lawrence et al., U.S. PG-Pub No. 2002/0138407 (reference A on the attached PTO-892).

15. As per claim 1, Lawrence et al. teaches a method to evaluate anti-money laundering risk, comprising: calculating a risk rating based on a set of values, each value being assigned to one of a plurality of different possible or selectable responses or answers for each of a multiplicity of criteria or questions associated with a group including at least one of a selected country, a selected financial product or investment, and a selected customer type (see paragraph 0026, lines 9-12 and paragraph 0032, lines 4-6); and performing a predetermined function in response to the risk rating (see paragraph 0031, lines 1-2).

16. As per claim 2, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 1 as described above. Lawrence further teaches defining the multiplicity of criteria or questions (see paragraph 0026, lines 9-12).

17. As per claim 3, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 2 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein defining the multiplicity of criteria or questions comprises at least one of: determining whether the selected country is cooperative; determining if the selected country is on an Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) list; determining an International Narcotics Strategy Report Rating; determining if the selected country is a member of the Financial Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF); determining if the selected country was a party to a 1988 United Nations Convention on drugs; determining a quality of local laws and regulations; determining a level of government support related to law enforcement and prosecution of offenders; determining a strength of the selected country's banking industry; and determining a quality of banking regulation and oversight (see paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

Art Unit: 3694

18. As per claim 4, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 2 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches wherein defining the multiplicity of criteria or questions comprises at least one of: determining if the selected customer type is currently being monitored; determining a level of knowledge about the selected customer type; and determining if the selected customer type is a risk for certain activities (see paragraph 0045, lines 3-10 and paragraph 0048, lines 16-20).

19. As per claim 5, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 2 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches wherein defining the multiplicity of criteria or questions comprises at least one of: determining a level of customer knowledge or sophistication needed to deal in the selected financial product or investment; determining a level of sophistication or complexity of the selected financial product or investment; determining the selected product or investment's propensity for use in money laundering activity; determining an ease of access to the selected financial product or investment; determining the selected financial product or investment's attractiveness for use by terrorist (see paragraph 0027, lines 4-7 and paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

20. As per claim 6, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 1 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches wherein calculating the risk rating comprises one of calculating an average of the set of values or a weighted average of the set of values (see paragraph 0037, lines 3-6).

21. As per claim 7, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 1 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches calculating at least one of a country risk rating, a customer type risk rating, a product risk rating and a relationship risk rating (see paragraph 0042, lines 7-10).

Art Unit: 3694

22. As per claim 8, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 1 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches presenting a graphical user interface for a user to enter at least one of an identification for a legal entity to be evaluated, a country associated with the legal entity to be evaluated, at least one financial product or investment associated with the legal entity to be evaluated, and at least one customer type associated with the legal entity to be evaluated (see paragraph 0032, lines 1-6).

23. As per claim 9, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 1 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches presenting a graphical user interface to edit the plurality of different possible or selectable responses or answers for each of the multiplicity of criteria or questions and values assigned to each of the plurality of responses or answers (see paragraph 0034, lines 1-3).

24. As per claim 10, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 1 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches presenting a graphical user interface for a user to select at least one of: if the selected country is a cooperative jurisdiction; if the selected country is on an Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) list; an International Narcotics Strategy Report Rating associated with the selected country; if the selected country is a member of the Financial Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF); if the selected country was a party to a 1988 United Nations Convention; a quality of local laws and regulations associated with the selected country; a level of government support in the selected country related to enforcement of laws and regulations and prosecution of offenders; a strength of banking industry associated with the selected country; and a quality of banking regulation and oversight associated with the selected country (see paragraph 0045, lines 3-10 and paragraph 0048, lines 16-20).

Art Unit: 3694

25. As per claim 11, Lawrence et al. teaches a method to evaluate anti-money laundering risk, comprising: identifying a person or other legal entity to be evaluated (see paragraph 0042, lines 1-4); selecting a country associated with the person or other legal entity; selecting at least one financial product or investment associated with the person or other legal entity (see paragraph 0045, lines 3-10); selecting a customer type associated with the person or other legal entity (see paragraph 0048, lines 1-4); and determining a risk rating based on responses to predetermined criteria or question related to the selected country, the at least one selected financial product or investment and the selected customer type (see paragraph 0048, lines 16-20).

26. As per claim 12, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein determining the risk comprises setting a value corresponding to each of the responses to the predetermined criteria or question (see paragraph 0048, lines 4-8).

27. As per claim 13, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 12 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein determining the risk comprises calculating one of an average or a weighted average of the values based on the selected country, the at least one selected financial product or investment and the selected customer type (see paragraph 0037, lines 3-6).

28. As per claim 14, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein determining the risk comprises at least one of: evaluating if the selected country is a cooperative jurisdiction; determining if the selected country was a party to the 1988 United Nations Convention on drugs; evaluating a quality of banking regulation and oversight in the selected country; determining if the selected country is associated with terrorist related activity or on the Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) list; evaluating a quality of local laws of the selected country; entering an International Narcotics Strategy Report Rating for

Art Unit: 3694

the selected country; evaluating a level of government support in the selected country for enforcement of laws and regulations and prosecution of offenses; determining if the selected country is a member of Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF); and determining strength of a banking industry in the selected country (see paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

29. As per claim 15, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein determining the risk comprises at least one of: evaluating the person or other legal entity's sophistication with respect to the at least one selected financial product or investment; determining the at least one selected financial product or investment's propensity for use for money laundering; determining the at least one selected financial product or investment's attractiveness for use by terrorist; evaluating a level of complexity of the at least one selected financial product or investment; determining if the at least one selected financial product or investment is currently monitored for use with respect to illegal activity; determining a level of the person or other legal entity's knowledge of the at least one financial product or investment; and determining a level of ease of obtaining and using the at least one financial product or investment (see paragraph 0027, lines 4-7 and paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

30. As per claim 16, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 11 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein determining the risk comprises at least one of: determining if the person or other legal entity is currently being monitored with respect to financial activity; determining a level of risk of the person or other legal entity being associated with terrorist activity; evaluating a level of knowledge about the person or other legal entity; and determining

Art Unit: 3694

if the person or other legal entity is known to be a high risk (see paragraph 0045, lines 3-10 and paragraph 0048, lines 16-20).

31. As per claim 17, Lawrence et al. teaches a system to evaluate anti-money laundering risk, comprising: a server (see paragraph 0038, lines 1-5); and a risk rating tool operable on the server (see paragraph 0039, lines 1-6).

32. As per claim 18, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 17 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein the risk rating tool is adapted to determine a risk rating based on responses to predetermined criteria related to a selected country, at least one selected financial product and a selected customer type (see paragraph 0026, lines 9-12 and paragraph 0032, lines 4-6).

33. As per claim 19, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 18 as described above. Lawrence further teaches a value being set corresponding to each of the responses to the predetermined criteria (see paragraph 0048, lines 4-8).

34. As per claim 20, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 19 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein the risk rating tool is programmed to calculate one of an average or a weighted average of the values based on the selected country, the at least one selected financial product and the selected customer type (see paragraph 0037, lines 3-6).

35. As per claim 21, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 17 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein the risk rating tool is programmed to determine a risk rating based on responses to predetermined criteria related to a selected country, the predetermined criteria comprising at least one of: a level of cooperativeness of the selected country with respect to anti-money laundering; the selected country being a party to the 1988 United Nations

Art Unit: 3694

Convention; a quality of banking regulations and oversight in the selected country; the selected country being associated with terrorist related activity; the selected country being on an Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) list; a quality of local laws of the selected country; an International Narcotics Strategy Report Rating for the selected country; a level of government support in the selected country for enforcement of laws and regulations and prosecution of offenses; the selected country being a member of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF); and strength of a banking system in the selected country (see paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

36. As per claim 22, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 17 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein the risk rating tool is programmed to determine a risk rating based on responses to predetermined criteria related to at least one selected financial product or investment, the predetermined criteria comprising: a customer sophistication with respect to the selected financial product or investment; a propensity of the selected financial product or investment for use for money laundering; an attractiveness of the selected financial product or investment for use by terrorist; a level of complexity of the financial product or investment; a current monitoring of the financial product or investment for use with respect to illegal activity; a level of a customer's or public's knowledge of the financial product or investment; and a level of ease of obtaining and using the financial product or investment (see paragraph 0027, lines 4-7 and paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

37. As per claim 23, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 17 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein the risk rating tool is programmed to determine a risk rating based on responses to predetermined criteria related to a selected customer type, the

Art Unit: 3694

predetermined criteria comprising: a customer currently being monitored with respect to financial activity; a level of risk of the customer being involved in terrorist activity; a level of a financial institutions knowledge of its customer; and the customer being known to be a high risk (see paragraph 0045, lines 3-10 and paragraph 0048, lines 16-20).

38. As per claim 24, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 17 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches wherein the risk rating tool is programmed to calculate a risk rating based on a set of values, each value being assigned to one of a plurality of different possible or selectable responses or answers for each of a multiplicity of criteria or questions associated with a group including at least one of a selected country, a selected financial product or investment and a selected customer type (see paragraph 0026, lines 9-12 and paragraph 0032, lines 4-6).

39. As per claim 25, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 24 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches a database including reports used to determine each of the set of values (see paragraph 0051, lines 1-2).

40. As per claim 26, Lawrence et al. teaches the system of claim 17 as described above.

Lawrence further teaches wherein the risk rating tool is programmed to present a graphical user interface for a user to select at least one of: if the selected country is a cooperative jurisdiction; if the selected country is on an Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) list; an International Narcotics Strategy Report Rating associated with the selected country; if the selected country is a member of the Financial Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF); if the selected country was a party to a 1988 United Nations Convention; a quality of local laws and regulations associated with the selected country; a level of government support related to enforcement of laws and regulations and prosecution of offenses; a strength of a banking industry associated with the

Art Unit: 3694

selected country; and a quality of banking regulation and oversight associated with the selected country (see paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

41. As per claim 27, Lawrence et al. teaches a method for making a system to evaluate anti-money laundering risk, comprising: providing a server (see paragraph 0038, lines 3-5); and providing a risk rating tool operable on the server (see paragraph 0039, lines 1-6).

42. As per claim 28, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 27 as described above. Lawrence further teaches adapting the risk rating tool to determine a risk rating based on responses to predetermined criteria related to a selected country, at least one selected financial product and a selected customer type (see paragraph 0026, lines 9-12 and paragraph 0032, lines 4-6).

43. As per claim 29, Lawrence et al. teaches the method of claim 27 as described above. Lawrence further teaches adapting the risk rating tool to determine the risk based on responses to predetermined criteria, the predetermined criteria comprising at least one of: a level of cooperativeness of the selected country with respect to anti-money laundering; the selected country being a party to the 1988 United Nations Convention; a quality of banking regulations and oversight in the selected country; the selected country being associated with terrorist related activity; the selected country being on an Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) list; a quality of local laws of the selected country; an International Narcotics Strategy Report Rating for the selected country; a level of government support in the selected country for enforcement of laws and regulations and prosecution of offenses; the selected country being a member of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF); and a strength of the banking system in the selected country (see paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

Art Unit: 3694

44. As per claim 30, Lawrence et al. teaches a computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing a method (see paragraph 0041, lines 11-23), comprising: calculating a risk rating based on a set of values, each value being assigned to one of a plurality of different possible or selectable responses or answers for each of a multiplicity of criteria or questions associated with a group including at least one of a selected country, a selected financial product or investment and a selected customer type (see paragraph 0026, lines 9-12 and paragraph 0032, lines 4-6); and performing a predetermined function in response to the risk rating (see paragraph 0031, lines 1-2).

45. As per claim 31, Lawrence et al. teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 30, wherein calculating a risk rating comprises one of calculating an average of the set of values or a weighted average of the set of values (see paragraph 0037, lines 3-6).

46. As per claim 32, Lawrence et al. teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 30 as described above. Lawrence further teaches calculating at least one of a country risk rating, a customer type risk rating, a product risk rating and a relationship risk rating (see paragraph 0042, lines 7-10).

47. As per claim 33, Lawrence et al. teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 30 as described above. Lawrence further teaches presenting a graphical user interface for a user to enter at least one of an identification for a legal entity to be evaluated, a country associated with the legal entity to be evaluated, at least one financial product or investment associated with the legal entity to be

Art Unit: 3694

evaluated, and a customer type associated with the legal entity to be evaluated (see paragraph 0032, lines 1-6).

48. As per claim 34, Lawrence et al. teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 30 as described above. Lawrence further teaches presenting a graphical user interface to edit the plurality of different possible or selectable responses or answers for each of the multiplicity of criteria or questions and values assigned to each of the plurality of responses or answers (see paragraph 0034, lines 1-3).

49. As per claim 35, Lawrence et al. teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 30 as described above. Lawrence further teaches wherein determining the risk comprises calculating one of an average or a weighted average of the values based on the selected country, the at least one selected financial product and the selected customer type (see paragraph 0037, lines 3-6).

50. As per claim 36, Lawrence et al. teaches the computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions for performing the method of claim 30 as described above. Lawrence further teaches presenting a graphical user interface for a user to select at least one of: if the selected country is a cooperative jurisdiction; if the selected country is on an Office of Foreign Asset Control (OFAC) list; an International Narcotics Strategy Report Rating associated with the selected country; if the selected country is a member of the Financial Task Force on Money Laundering (FATF); if the selected country was a party to a 1988 United Nations Convention; a quality of local laws and regulations associated with the selected country; a level of government support related to enforcement of laws and regulations and prosecution of offenses; a strength of

Art Unit: 3694

a banking industry associated with the selected country; and a quality of banking regulation and oversight associated with the selected country (see paragraph 0054, lines 6-11).

Conclusion

51. Applicant(s) are reminded that as a matter of linguistic precision, optional or conditional elements (e.g. "if," "may," etc.) do not narrow the claims because they can always be omitted.

See also MPEP §2106 II C: "Language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.]"

52. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SAMICA L. NORMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-1371. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30a-4p, w/ 1st Fri off & 2nd 6:30a-3p.

53. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Dixon can be reached on (571) 272-6703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3694

54. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

sln
/Ella Colbert/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3694